REMARKS

This submission is in response to the Final Rejection dated November 14, 2007, and is filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE).

Applicants have amended the specification in paragraph [0037] to obviate an inadvertent typographical error. Applicants have further amended claims 1, 11 and 20 to recite the invention with more particularity. Claim 20 was re-written into Beauregard format. Support for the amendments herein is found in the specification at least in paragraphs [0036] - [0039], in view of FIG. 3 nos. 98, 100, 102, and the "To" button associated with address box 96. Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter has been added via the amendments set forth herein.

Claims 1, 11, 13, 16, 17 and 20 have been amended. Claims 10, 12, 15 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new claims have been added. Consequently, claims 1-9, 11, 13, 14 and 16-20 are pending in this application.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6, 11-18 and 20 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Grossman, *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0119761) (hereinafter "Grossman").

The primary cited reference to Grossman is directed to a user interface to display contact information for a predetermined contact from one or more contact information directories 280a, 280b, 280c that correspond with different applications (See Grossman, par. [0050]). The displayed data includes contact information, communication histories, and files associated with the contact. (See Grossman, pars. [0042], [0046], and [0051] - [0053]). The user interface also displays content-centric tasks 450 that can initiate an activity or communication with the contact. One of the content-centric tasks 450 is an icon to send email to the contact. (See Grossman, par. [0059] in view of FIG. 4, no. 450, first entry from the top). Another of the content-centric tasks 450 is an icon to call the contact. (See Grossman, par. [0059] in view of FIG. 4, no. 450, third entry from the top).

In traversing the rejection of independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that Grossman fails to disclose at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants first respectfully submit that Grossman does not disclose a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for *user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field.* Although Grossman discloses a user interface that displays certain information for a contact (Grossman, FIG. 4, nos. 410, 420), Grossman does not provide *a selector* to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for *user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field.* Additionally, although Grossman discloses the use of an icon to initiate communication with the contact (*e.g.,* contact-centric task 450 – "Send email"), Grossman does not provide a selector to initiate the recited address menu on the graphical user interface of claim 1. Furthermore, Grossman's user interface does not allow user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields for the displayed contact. The Examiner alleged that Grossman's FIG. 7 shows multiple address fields as recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. FIG. 7 shows a user interface in edit mode to edit contact information for the contact. In editing contact information, the user may add, delete or change contact information, and may further designate a preferred email and phone number. However, editing of contact information and indicating preferred contact information (email, phone) does not disclose user selection of multiple addresses, as recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants further respectfully submit that Grossman does not disclose an *address box* associated with an outgoing electronic message *capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field* for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses. Specifically, Grossman does not disclose an address box associated with an electronic message. The Examiner alleged that the general display of contact information (no. 410 in FIG 4) or the communication history (nos.

510, 520 and 530 of FIG. 5) disclose the address box recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree. Displays 410, and 510-530 are not associated with an outgoing electronic message. That is, the general display of contact information in FIG. 4 or the display of communication history in FIG. 5 does not disclose an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message. In Grossman, in order for the user to display an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message, the user would have to select a contact-centric task 450 (i.e., "Send email") to activate an email display. However, Grossman fails to disclose an outgoing electronic message display and its associated address box. Therefore, displays 410, and 510-530 are not associated with an outgoing electronic message. Because Grossman does not disclose the *address box* associated with an outgoing electronic message, Grossman further does not disclose an address box that is *capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field* for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses.

Consequently, Grossman fails to disclose at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and an address box capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of an outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 1. Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2-6, based at least on their dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

In traversing the rejection of independent claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit that Grossman fails to disclose at least "initiating a graphical user interface (GUI) element to present an address menu comprising contact information for at least one potential addressee, the contact information including a first selectable address and a selectable second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee, recognizing a selection of the first address and the second

address, and initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing message," as particularly recited in independent claim 11.

Applicants reiterate that Grossman's user interface does not disclose user selection of a first selectable address and a second selectable addresses for its displayed contact. Grossman's editing of contact information and indicating preferred contact information for a contact in FIG. 7 does not disclose user selection of a first selectable address and a second selectable address. Applicants further respectfully submit that Grossman does not disclose the selected first address and the selected second address in the address box associated with an outgoing electronic message. Specifically, Grossman does not disclose an address box associated with an outgoing message, and further does not disclose the selected first address and the selected second address in the address box. Grossman's general display of contact information in FIG. 4 or the display of communication history in FIG. 5 does not disclose an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message.

Consequently, Grossman fails to disclose at least "initiating a graphical user interface (GUI) element to present an address menu comprising contact information for at least one potential addressee, the contact information including a first selectable address and a selectable second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee, recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address, and initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing message," as particularly recited in independent claim 11.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) of independent claim 11. Applicants further respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 13, 14, 16-18, based at least on their dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 11.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Grossman in view of Landesmann (U.S. Pat. No. 7,072,943).

The secondary cited reference to Landesmann is directed to granting deposit-contingent e-mailing rights. More specifically, Landesmann provides for an email guarantee that allows

users/potential recipients of email to grant others the right to send the users emails on the condition that a sender of an email pays a fee in the event that the user/recipient considers the email to be an unwanted intrusion ("spam") (See Landesmann, Col. 5, lines 11-17).

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 7 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that the Grossman-Landesmann combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 7 and 8 depend, either directly or indirectly.

Applicants respectfully submit that Grossman does not teach or suggest a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface as recited in claim 1. Grossman's user interface does not teach or suggest user selection of multiple addresses for its displayed contact. That is, Grossman's editing of contact information and indicating preferred contact information for a contact in FIG. 7 does not teach or suggest user selection of multiple addresses. Grossman does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an electronic outgoing message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses. Specifically, Grossman fails to teach or suggest an address box associated with an outgoing message and further fails to teach or suggest the address box capable of receiving user-selected addressees. Grossman's general display of contact information in FIG. 4 or the display of communication history in FIG. 5 does not disclose an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message. The secondary cited reference to Landesmann fails to rectify the deficiencies identified with respect to Grossman. Specifically, Landesmann's provision of email guarantees does not teach or suggest the deficiencies identified above with respect to Grossman.

Consequently, the Grossman-Landesmann combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and

an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 7 and 8 depend, either directly or indirectly.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of claims 7 and 8, based at least on their dependencies, whether direct or indirect, from independent claim 1.

Claim 9 as rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Grossman in view of Landesmann and in further view of Fernandes (U.S. Pat. No. 6,014,135).

The tertiary cited reference to Fernandes is directed to a computer interface that displays plural icons representative of people, documents and time. (See Fernandez, Abstract and Col. 10, lines 6-47, nos. 40, 42, 44 and 46). A user can create a document such as an email (or text document or spreadsheet document) by activating the 4th icon 46b in FIG. 3, which displays a composition display interface 50 of FIG. 4 for entering text of an email. (See Fernandes, Col. 10, lines 50-65). The entered text for an email document can be routed by activating the router tab on display 50, which displays the routing display of FIG. 5 that shows icons of the individuals to whom to send the email. For each icon associated with the individual, there are routing options as to the location where the individual would receive the email (*i.e.,* at work *or* at home *or* on the road) and there are available format options for the email (*i.e.,* text, html, fax, audio, video). (See Fernandes, Col. 10, line 66 – Col. 11, line 27). Once the routing options are selected, the user may press the "send now" button in the routing display of FIG. 5 to send the email. (See Fernandes, FIG. 5).

In traversing the rejection of dependent claims 7 and 8, Applicants respectfully submit that the Grossman-Landesmann-Fernandes combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple

user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 7 and 8 depend, either directly or indirectly.

The Grossman-Landesmann combination does not teach or suggest presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses for a contact from the address menu. Further, the Grossman-Landesmann combination does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an electronic outgoing message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses.

The tertiary cited reference to Fernandes does not rectify the deficiencies identified in relation to the Grossman-Lendessman combination addressed above. The routing display in FIG. 5 of Fernandes displays multiple individuals to whom to send email. However, the routing options allow selection of one address for an individual to which the email is sent (*i.e.*, at work *or* at home *or* on the road) (See Fernandes, Col. 11, lines 7-9). That is, Fernandes does not provide the ability to select multiple addresses for each individual to which to send email. Further, Fernandes does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an electronic outgoing message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses. That is, Fernandes does not teach or suggest a separate address box associated with the email message that is capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses for a recipient. In Fernandes, the user simply presses the "send now" button to transmit the email message.

Consequently, the Grossman-Landesmann combination fails to teach or suggest at least "a selector to initiate presentation of the address menu on the graphical user interface for user selection of multiple addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field, and an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message capable of receiving multiple user-selected addresses from the plurality of address fields of the identification field for subsequent transfer of the outgoing electronic message to the user-selected addresses," as particularly recited in independent claim 1 from which claims 9 depends.

Claim 10 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Grossman in view of Shavit, *et al.* (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0160757). This rejection is now moot in view of the cancellation of claim 10. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 10 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 19 was rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Grossman in view of Fernandes.

In traversing the rejection of dependent claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that the Grossman-Fernandes combination fails to teach or suggest at least "initiating a graphical user interface (GUI) element to present an address menu comprising contact information for at least one potential addressee, the contact information including a first selectable address and a selectable second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee, recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address, and initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing message," as particularly recited in independent claim 11 from which claim 19 depends.

Grossman's user interface does not teach or suggest user selection of a first selectable address and a second selectable address for its displayed contact. Grossman's editing of contact information and indicating preferred contact information for a contact in FIG. 7 does not teach or suggest user selection of a first selectable address and a second selectable addresses. Applicants further respectfully reiterate that Grossman does not teach or suggest the presentation of the selected first address and the selected second address in an address box associated with an outgoing message. Specifically, Grossman does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an outgoing message and further does not teach or suggest the selected first address and the selected second address being presented in the address box. Grossman's general display of contact information in FIG. 4 or the display of communication history in FIG. 5 does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an outgoing electronic message.

Fernandes does not rectify the identified deficiencies in Grossman. The routing display in FIG. 5 of Fernandes displays multiple individuals to whom to send email. However, the routing options allow selection of one address for an individual to which the email is sent (*i.e.*, at

work *or* at home *or* on the road) (See Fernandes, Col. 11, lines 7-9). That is, Fernandes does not provide the ability to select a first address and a second address for each individual to which to send them email. Furthermore, Fernandes does not teach or suggest an address box associated with an electronic outgoing message presenting the first and the second user-selected addresses for subsequent transfer of the outgoing message to the user-selected addresses. That is, Fernandes does not teach or suggest presentation of the first and the second user-selected addresses for a recipient in a separate address box associated with the email message. In Fernandes, the user simply presses the "send now" button to transmit the email message.

Consequently, the Grossman-Frenandes combination fails to teach or suggest at least "initiating a graphical user interface (GUI) element to present an address menu comprising contact information for at least one potential addressee, the contact information including a first selectable address and a selectable second selectable address for the at least one potential addressee, recognizing a selection of the first address and the second address, and initiating presentation of the first address and the second address in an address box associated with an outgoing message," as particularly recited in independent claim 11 from which claim 19 depends.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of dependent claim 19, based at least on its indirect dependency from independent claim 11.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have pointed out specific features of the claims not disclosed, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references applied in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the objections and rejections, as well as an indication of the allowability of each of the pending claims.

Any changes to the claims in this Amendment, which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Page 16 of 17   U.S. App. No.: 10/673,673

PAGE 20/21 * RCVD AT 1/8/2008 3:46:43 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/19 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5123275575 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-50

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of this application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

_____1-8-20-8_____

Date

Jeffrey G. Toler, Reg. No. 38,342
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Toler Law Group, Intellectual Properties
8500 Bluffstone Cove, Suite A201
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 327-5515 (phone)
(512) 327-5575 (fax)